

5090
Ser T4E2GM/L3336
27 May 1993

From: Commander, Western Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
To: Distribution

Subj: NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES

Encl: (1) Progress Review Meeting Minutes of April 2, 1993
(2) Progress Review Meeting Minutes of May 12, 1993

1. Enclosures (1) and (2) provide the minutes of our Progress Review meetings held on April 2, 1993 and May 12, 1993 at the Naval Air Station Alameda and the Department of Toxic Substances Control office in Berkeley, respectively.

2. If you have any questions, please contact either Mr. Gary J. Munekawa, Code T4E2GM, (415) 244-2524 or Mr. George Kikugawa, Code T4E2GK, (415) 244-2559.

Original signed by:

GARY J. MUNEKAWA
Remedial Project Manager

Distribution:

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Tom Lanphar)
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attn: James Nusrata)
US Environmental Protection Agency (Attn: Julie Anderson Rubin)

Copy to (w/encl):

NAS Alameda (Attn: Lt. Mike Petouhoff)
NADEP Alameda (Attn: Paul Pentony)
COMNAVBASE San Francisco (Attn: Randy Friedman)
PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (Attn: Duane Balch)
Montgomery Watson (Attn: Ken Leung)

Blind copy to (w/encl):

T4E, T4E2MP, 18A, T4E2GM, T4E2GK
Admin Record (w/3 copies)
Chron, blue, pink, green
WRITER: G. Munekawa/T4E2GM/X2524
TYPIST: G. Munekawa
FILE: Alameda/NAS

**MONTHLY PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY
NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA
(Held at the Alameda Naval Air Station)**

April 2, 1993

Attendees:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Tom Lanphar	Dept. Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)	(510) 540-3809
James Nusrala	Regional Water Quality Control Board	(510) 286-0301
Kenneth Leung	Montgomery Watson	(510) 975-3460
Scott Weber	Montgomery Watson	(510) 975-3511
Mike Petouhoff	Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda	(510) 263-3726
Randy Cate	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3716
Sherri Withrow	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3724
Duane Balch	PRC Environmental Management, Inc.	(916) 852-8300
Gary Munekawa	U.S. Navy, Western Div. (WESTDIV)	(415) 244-2524
George Kikugawa	WESTDIV	(415) 244-2559

AGENDA ITEMS:

I. RI/FS Schedule

- The DTSC indicated in a letter to the Navy dated March 16, 1993, that in the opinion of the DTSC, NAS Alameda may be found in non-compliance with the July 1, 1988 Remedial Action Order (RAO) issued by the DTSC's predecessor, the Department of Health Services. The DTSC requested that the Navy must commit to beginning work on the Phase 2A follow-on field sampling plan (FSP) so as to facilitate continuity with the follow-on work at the other RI sites. The Navy prepared a response to the March 16, 1993, DTSC letter on April 1, 1993, and a copy was hand-delivered to Mr. Tom Lanphar from Lt. Mike Petouhoff at this meeting.
- The April 1, 1993, Navy letter to DTSC proposes that work on the Phase 2A FSP will be started in June 1993. Furthermore the Navy suggests that the work outlined in the RAO be addressed by a Federal Facilities Site Remediation Agreement (FFSRA). The Navy offers to base the FFSRA on those already in place for other Bay Area federal facilities, and provides points of contact at WESTDIV and NAS Alameda to initiate the generation of an FFSRA.
- Mr. Lanphar asked how soon could the Navy initiate the FFSRA, and asked when it could be finalized. Lt. Petouhoff suggested a fiscal year deadline or about September/October 1993, for completion. Mr. Lanphar also asked if the recently announced base closure activities would affect FFSRA implementation and timing.
- DTSC and Navy agreed to schedule a meeting to discuss format and content of the FFSRA. Mr. Lanphar said that DTSC would respond

to the April 1, 1993, Navy letter quickly, and suggested a meeting in May to start discussion of FFSRA content. WESTDIV legal counsel Mr. Marvin Norman will be involved.

- The content of a letter sent by Mr. Tom Lanphar of the DTSC to the Navy on March 29, 1993, was briefly discussed. This letter addressed a proposed schedule for RI/FS activities at NAS Alameda previously submitted by the Navy to the DTSC on March 4, 1993. The letter outlined DTSC comments for additions to the revised RI/FS schedule. These included presenting the schedule in two formats, one as the current "Gant" or timeline schedule, and the other organized as a table with a listing of deliverable documents (and dates) categorized as primary and secondary documents. Examples of primary documents include work plans, field sampling plans, quality assurance project plans, and the final RI and FS documents. Secondary documents might include data dumps, technical memorandums, and contract task order modification reports.
- The DTSC letter of March 29, 1993, also listed the State's document review periods as follows:

- Draft Work Plans and Secondary Documents	45 days
- Draft RI Report and FS Report	60 days
- Draft Final Reports	30 days
- The Navy agrees to provide a schedule with dates for RI/FS deliverables/activities by the next progress review meeting.

II. Removal Actions for IMF Site Recommended Alternatives

- The Navy delivered copies of the draft IMF Site Interim Remedial Action Disposal/Treatment Alternatives Report at this meeting. Mr. Lanphar indicated that he would provide DTSC comments within two weeks.

III. Status of Ecological Assessment

- The Navy indicated that field sampling activities were continuing and that the bioassay work on previously collected samples had begun. Mr. Lanphar and Mr. James Nusrala of the RWQCB said they planned to be out at the ecological assessment sites next week with the sampling personnel from Kinnetics Laboratories to receive an overview of the field activities and to witness sampling activities.
- The DTSC waived its standard 3-day waiting period between storms to sample storm discharges, since recent rains have been occurring at intervals of less than 3 days.

IV. Phases 1 and 2A Data Comments

- On March 4, 1993, the Navy received DTSC comments on the draft Phases 1 and 2A Data Summary Report (DSR). Response to comments are being addressed by the Navy as part of the contract task

order to be issued to the PRC team under Contract Task Order (CTO) No. 0121 Modification No. 02. This modification will also address preparation of the Phase 2A FSP.

- Additional sampling locations requested by the DTSC at the landfill sites are addressed in the Phases 5 and 6 Follow-on FSP submitted at today's meeting.

V. RI/FS Work Plan Revision

- The RI/FS Work Plan Revision is being generated with internal review to be completed in May/June.

VI. Status of Phases 5 and 6 Follow-on Investigation Work Plan

- Draft copies of the Field Sampling Plan for Follow-on Work, Phases 5 and 6, Landfill Investigations, were hand-delivered to the DTSC and RWQCB at today's meeting.

VII. Status of Phases 2B and 3 Follow-on Investigation Work Plan

- Draft copies of the Follow-on Field Sampling Plan, Phases 2B and 3, were hand-delivered to the DTSC and RWQCB at today's meeting.

VIII. CTO 0121 Modification No. 02 for the Phase 2A Follow-on Field Sampling Plan, and CTO 0252 for the Building 5 Plating Shop Site Investigation

- The Navy indicated that as part of its response to the DTSC's March 16, 1993, letter (see Section I. above) it was beginning contractual activities to start preparation of the Phase 2A FSP (CTO 0121 Mod 02). Also discussed was contractual activity for funding the remaining site investigative work required at the Site 5 plating shop (CTO 0252). The Navy indicated that they expected to award these activities in June/July 1993.
- The Navy told the DTSC and RWQCB that the target date for getting a draft Phase 2A FSP to them would be August 12, 1993.

IX. Other Issues

- Mr. Lanphar indicated that he would be assisted in the future review of documents and other technical support by Mr. Joseph Chou.
- Tentative date for the next progress review meeting was set for May 5, 1993 at DTSC (this was subsequently changed to May 12, 1993).
- Following adjournment of the meeting, the meeting participants were lead on a drive-by tour of selected Installation Restoration Program sites, including Sites 1, 2, 4, 7A, 7B, 9, 11, 13 (including the Building 397 fuel release site), 14, 15, 17, and 19.

**MONTHLY PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY
NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA
(Held at the DTSC Office in Berkeley)**

May 12, 1993

Attendees:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Tom Lanphar	Dept. Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)	(510) 540-3809
Joseph Chou	DTSC	(510) 540-3775
James Nusrala	Regional Water Quality Control Board	(510) 286-0301
Scott Weber	Montgomery Watson	(510) 975-3511
Mike Petouhoff	Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda	(510) 263-3726
Randy Cate	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3716
Amelia Duque	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3715
Roger Caswell	Naval Aviation Depot	(510) 263-6241
Duane Balch	PRC Environmental Management, Inc.	(916) 852-8300
Marcelo Pascua	U.S. Navy, Western Div. (WESTDIV)	(415) 244-2522
Gary Munekawa	WESTDIV	(415) 244-2524
George Kikugawa	WESTDIV	(415) 244-2559

AGENDA ITEMS:

I. IMF Site Removal Action

- The Navy discussed its progress towards implementing an interim removal action at the IMF site. The DTSC indicated that it preferred Alternatives No. 4 (excavation with recycling), or Alternative No. 5 (excavation with disposal to a Class I facility) if lead/acid levels would not allow recycling.
- The Navy discussed how it intended to use Navy Public Works Center personnel under supervision of the PRC team to perform the excavation work. Also discussed were issues related to confirmatory soil sampling and Regulatory Agency comments to the draft IMF Site Interim Removal Action Disposal/Treatment Alternatives Report. Mr. Tom Lanphar of the DTSC indicated that he would check with DTSC management concerning collection of composite soil samples versus bottom and sidewall samples from the excavation pit. Other discussion topics included possibly using some type of accelerated field screening techniques for lead, and monitoring well abandonment protocols/permits.
- The Navy indicated that it would be issuing the request for proposal/statement of work (RFP/SOW) for implementing the removal action to the PRC team by the end of May. Due to possible funding constraints, the Navy stated that it would make every effort to mobilize the field work (begin excavation) by mid-August. This would involve cooperation between the Navy and the Regulatory Agencies (i.e. close communication and "over-the-shoulder" reviews and responses by all parties) to accelerate an

implementation work plan suitable for removal action by mid August.

II. Federal Facilities Site Remediation Agreement (FFSRA)

- Work continues on drafting a Federal Facilities Site Remediation Agreement (FFSRA) for NAS Alameda. The Navy is putting together the facility-specific information required for the draft, and a listing of the chemicals of concern for the facility was discussed with the DTSC.
- Based on current work loads, the Navy felt it should try to finish the draft by June/July for Regulatory Agency review and comment.

III. RI/FS Schedule

- A draft copy of a 12-page RI/FS schedule was shown to the DTSC and RWQCB. The schedule was put together as requested by the DTSC in their March 29, 1993, letter to the Navy, and included start-end dates and deliverables for all anticipated RI/FS and Remedial Action Plan activities. As a result of discussions of the timing of some DTSC reviews of secondary documents (e.g. the follow-on field sampling plans [FSP], it was agreed that some of the scheduled reviews would be shifted and that the RI/FS schedule would be regenerated.

IV. Status of Ecological Assessment

- The Navy indicated that field sampling activities and bioassay work on previously collected samples were continuing, but that this week no field sampling was occurring so that the bioassay work would not get too backlogged. Mr. James Nusrata of the RWQCB said they had been out in the field in mid-April to witness the ecological assessment field work (in some instances actually assisting with sample gathering), and found the process to be very thorough and interesting.

V. RI/FS Work Plan Revision

- The RI/FS Work Plan Revision is nearing completion, and Navy expects to complete its internal review of the revisions by the end of June.

VI. Status of Phases 2B and 3, and Phases 5 and 6 Follow-on Field Sampling Plans

- Draft copies of the Field Sampling Plans for Follow-on Work, Phases 2B and 3; and for Phases 5 and 6, Landfill Investigations; were hand-delivered to the DTSC and RWQCB on April 2, 1993. Mr. Lanphar indicated that his review of both FSPs would be completed by June 1, 1993.
- Mr. Lanphar inquired as to the rationale for sampling in the Runway areas. Mr. Weber of Montgomery Watson, explained how this

area was used for background reference data to Sites 1 and 2, and as a tie-in to the upgradient RI sites east of the Runway Area.

VII. CTO 0121 Modification No. 02 for the Phase 2A Follow-on Field Sampling Plan

- The Navy discussed its continuing contractual activities to start preparation of the Phase 2A FSP (CTO 0121 Mod 02).
- The Navy told the DTSC and RWQCB that the revised target date for getting a draft Phase 2A FSP to them was now August 17, 1993.

IX. CTO 0252 for the Building 5 Plating Shop Site Investigation

- Also discussed was contractual activity for funding the remaining site investigative work required at the Site 5 plating shop (CTO 0252). The Navy indicated that they expected to negotiate this CTO by mid-June.

X. Interim Removal Actions (IRA) at Sites 7A and 15

- The Navy told the DTSC and RWQCB that it had drafted up separate SOWs for removal action activities at Sites 7A and 15. It expects that these SOWs will be distributed to its contractor before the end of May.

XI. IMF Floating Product Removal

- Mr. Munekawa provided copies of the IT Corporation progress reports (dated April 30 and May 11, 1993) on the status of the floating product recovery activities occurring at the IMF site. After installation and testing, a floating product recovery system installed in well MW-IMF-01 was activated by March 26, 1993. The system has recovered about 6.4 gallons of "black oil" in 26 days. According to IT Corp., as of May 11, 1993, the system was recovering about 50 milliliters per week (about three cubic inches for perspective). It was noted that during soil excavation for the removal action at the IMF site it is possible that this well will be abandoned and destroyed.

XII. Other Issues

- The Navy informed DTSC and RWQCB that due to concerns at other Navy facilities (e.g. Hunters Point), that it had provided the Navy's Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO) Yorktown, Virginia with copies of past reports dealing with the usage, handling, disposal and field sampling of radioactive waste materials. Following any comments from RASO, the Navy stated that they would keep the agencies informed if any new information became available. Current information indicates that a radium dial painting shop near Site 10A (Building 400) was decontaminated in 1979, and separately, that radium-bearing wastes (scrapings, rags, etc.) were reportedly disposed (quantities unknown) at the landfills at Sites 1 and 2. It was

suggested that a Geiger-Mueller meter be used for radiation screening during the subsequent field work at these sites.

- Mr. Roger Caswell of NADEP asked for copies of the Volume 2 (of 2) document that was part of the August 1992 draft final CTO 0121 Modification No. 01 data summary report.
- No future meeting date was set for the next progress review meeting, though it is expected one will be scheduled after the participants meet for the next Technical Review Committee meeting at the DTSC office in Berkeley at 0900 on June 2, 1993.

•
•